1	VOTING BY MAIL: AN EXAMINATION OF
2	STATE AND LOCAL EXPERIENCES
3	
4	WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 2010
5	
6	
7	United States Senate
8 9	Committee on Rules and Administration Washington, D.C
э L О	wasnington, b.c
L1	
L2	The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:06 a.m., in Room SR-301, Russell
L3	Senate Office Building, Hon. Charles E. Schumer, Chairman of the committee, presiding.
L 4	Present: Senators Schumer and Roberts.
L5	Staff Present: Jean Bordewich, Staff Director; Jason Abel, Chief Counsel;
L 6	Veronica Gillespie, Elections Counsel; Adam Ambrogi, Counsel; Sonia Gill, Counsel; Julia
L7	Richardson, Counsel; Lauryn Bruck, Professional Staff; Lynden Armstrong, Chief Clerk;
L8	Matthew McGowan, Professional Staff; Mary Jones, Republican Staff Director; Paul
L 9	Vinovich, Republican Chief Counsel; Michael Merrell, Republican Counsel; Rachel
20	Creviston, Republican Professional Staff; and Justin Lee, Republican Intern.
21	OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN SCHUMER
22	Chairman Schumer. The Rules Committee will come to order. Good morning.
23	First, I want to thank my friend, Senator Roberts, for joining us this morning. Ranking
24	Member Bennett is unable to attend. I would also like to welcome Senator Ron Wyder
25	of Oregon and Congresswoman Susan Davis of California, two very strong advocates of
2.6	voting by mail.

Now, I have had a lot of opportunity to work with Senator Wyden on many, many occasions, most recently on the DISCLOSE Act, where a major portion of our bill comes from provisions that he and Senator Collins put together originally. I can say that there is no truer champion of reform than Senator Wyden. He is a great champion for all Oregon constituents and Oregon is always first on his mind when he is legislating.

In this case, I can tell the public here that I, probably a minimum of 25 times, have heard Ron Wyden talk to the Democratic Caucus about why voting by mail is a great thing and how well it works in Oregon, as recently as our last Tuesday lunch, not about this hearing, but it came up. So we are honored to have him here today and look forward to his insight, experience, firsthand knowledge of election law issues.

I also want to thank Congresswoman Davis, who has also called me on this issue on several occasions and is as strong an advocate in the House as Senator Wyden is in the Senate.

So we are going to examine vote by mail systems and programs used by States for Federal elections. Vote by mail is no longer a rare exception. Today, many voters throughout the country exercise their constitutional right to vote by mailing in their ballot, and the most well known vote by mail State is Oregon, which is the only State that conducts all elections entirely through its vote by mail system. It is amazing, and I followed it a little bit myself.

Washington State is a close second. It conducts elections in 38 of 39 counties

- by mail. I don't know if one of our witnesses can tell us why one county isn't involved.
- 49 Maybe they don't have the Post Office serving them.

Meanwhile, Colorado voters cast ballots by mail at a 64 percent rate. And in our largest State, California, voters went 44 percent by mail in the 2008 Federal elections. Some of those States are represented by members on this committee,

Senator Feinstein and Senator Murray.

But what do we actually mean when we talk about vote by mail? There are two different ideas and we are going to discuss them today.

First is what many call, appropriately, the Oregon model. In this model, a State does not have polling places and its election is conducted solely by mail. The second is what is called the "no excuse absentee balloting," or universal vote by mail. In this system, polling places still exist as much as they do in other States, but voters can choose to vote absentee and by mail without any reason whatsoever.

I am happy that my own State of New York just decided to adopt the second model--not that I prefer it over the first, but at least it is better than nothing--of no excuse absentee balloting. We joined 29 other States that offer no excuse absentee balloting and four States that provide permanent no excuse absentee balloting.

Finally today, we will discuss how to give voters the tools to track their ballots once sent. If people can track a package when it arrives, surely the technology is there to track a ballot.

It is an issue that we have had some experience, successful experience, in this

the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment Act, known as the MOVE Act, as part of the National Defense Authorization last year. It ensures that all States permit military and overseas citizens and their dependents to register and vote by absentee.

One of the most important aspects of that law, which passed with

Congresswoman Davis's strong support in the House, is that it requires election

jurisdictions to provide to all military and overseas voters free access to notification that their voted ballots have been received by the local Board of Elections.

Congresswoman Davis has her own bill, which passed the House on the Suspension

Calendar, H.R. 2510, which is aimed at providing that same free access notification to all absentee voters in the country. I look forward to learning more about this particular proposal, as well.

Vote by mail elections will help all eligible voters to register and vote in Federal elections, including disabled voters and their caretakers, Americans holding down two jobs who can't get away to vote, and just about anyone who can't get to the polls but wants to exercise their prized constitutional right.

So after we hear from our two Members of Congress, we are going to be lucky to hear from State and local election officials who can relate their experiences with these programs. They have been on the ground in the areas of policy, law, legislation, and implementation of vote by mail programs. We can all benefit from their experience.

Senator Roberts?

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERTS

Senator Roberts. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a privilege to be here to pinch hit or stand in for Bob Bennett.

I might observe that in a unique test of observation by the media on Capitol Hill, many times, we have been mistaken for one another. This is somewhat unique in that Bob is six inches taller than I am and he, when a member or the Chairman of the Joint Commission on Economics and I was the Intelligence Committee Chairman, were being asked by media, Mr. Chairman, all the time different questions, they would ask me about the Fed and about the interest rate and about the economy, and I would say, well, we are going to take that up very quickly and if you will just get back to me, I can have something for you later. And Bob, when asked about an intelligence matter, would simply smile and say, "Well, you know I can't say anything about that."

And so we have become sort of a, what, band of brothers in regards to the media, I guess, inquiries. That still has puzzled me, other than the fact that I think we both belong to the follicly challenged caucus. Perhaps that is the reason that one is mistaken for the other.

It is a pleasure to be here with you. I have known the Chairman. We served together in the House and now serve in the Senate. The Chairman is known for his legislative prowess and his political acumen. I simply want to thank him for getting who I was in 2008 and I appreciate that very much.

111	So at any rate, with Ron Wyden, Ron comes from Wichita, along with some other
112	very famous person that we know at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and so I have known
113	him for a long time and he serves on the Intelligence Committee. I think you are still
114	serving there. And I appreciate his efforts. If there is one person who does reach out
115	and tries to be bipartisan in regards to the challenges that we must face, it is Ron. And
116	so, Ron, I really appreciate your friendship and your service.

And Susan is a member of the sometimes powerful House Administration

Committee, of which I was a member many, many years in the House--

Chairman Schumer. It was always powerful when you were on it, Senator Roberts.

Senator Roberts. It was always very chaotic and very controversial, but at least I think we got some things done, so thank you to the members. I am looking forward to the panel.

The Constitution under Article I, Section 4, states the time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof. Although the Constitution does permit Congress to make laws that affect elections, it is clear that the Founders intended for the responsibility and administration of elections to remain within the States and accountable directly to their voters.

Since 1995, my State of Kansas has permitted advance so-called no excuse balloting for Kansans who fill out the appropriate application and meet the statutory

requirements. There are some county--there is county flexibility due to cost and access and things of that nature, however. They may vote prior to Election Day either by mail or in person at a location approved by their County Election Office.

Now, 27 other States have various forms of advance balloting, but it is important to remember that 22 don't. These States have chosen probably for different reasons, I suspect cost and other matters, not to initiate advance balloting. That choice must be respected, I think, by the Federal Government as well as by other States.

And I understand that some advocate extending advance balloting to States that have not adopted advance balloting. Others highlight concerns that doing so opens the door to abuses such as fraud. For example, in Essex County, New Jersey--where else--there is an ongoing investigation of fraudulent absentee ballots in the 2007 Senate race and this is not the only example. We could go on and on.

Worse yet, we must consider the possibility of coercion. The concept of the secret ballot is one of the cornerstones of democracy and we must exercise extreme caution with any form of legislation that could potentially or inadvertently undermine the secret ballot and open the door to intimidation of individuals when voting on candidates or questions before them on Election Day.

I thank the Chairman again for calling this hearing. I look forward to the witnesses' testimony. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

151 Chairman Schumer. Thank you, Senator Roberts.

And now we will hear from Senator Wyden.

STATEMENT OF HON. RON WYDEN, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF

155 OREGON

Senator Wyden. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. With your leave, let me just spare you the speechifying and maybe just highlight a few of my main concerns.

I don't want to make this a bouquet-tossing contest, but I also especially appreciate the way you, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Roberts and Senator Bennett tackle these issues in a bipartisan way. I think both of my colleagues know that Senator Grassley and I, for example, have spent a full decade trying to eliminate secret holds here in the United States Senate, another effort to open up the political process to make Government more accountable.

Senator Schumer, when I talked to him about this a decade ago, the very first question Senator Schumer asked me was, are you doing this in a bipartisan way, so Chairman Schumer, I am very appreciative of the fact that you have put a special focus on these issues that are so important to democracy to work in a bipartisan fashion, and it is obvious you are doing that again.

And to my friend, Senator Roberts, my former Chairman on the Intelligence

Committee, we have worked together often on so many issues, and to work with you

and Senator Bennett, and he, of course, has been my partner on a number of economic

issues, health, and others, this is exactly what we need more of in the United States

Senate, and so I very much appreciate the way you all are tackling these issues.

I am the first United States Senator to have been elected by mail. Suffice it to say, when you look at the 30-year history of what Oregon has done, what you see is that this empowers voters. They have almost three weeks to have a ballot in their hand to get more informed on the issues. It has increased turnout. It is cost effective. And on the central issue that colleagues have asked me about as they have looked at it, I am of the view that it reduces election fraud, and let me cut to the bottom line on this issue.

We know that elections are contentious matters. People have passionate differences of opinion. The first point on this issue, in the history of our using vote by mail, and it goes back almost 30 years, and I mentioned this to my friend, Senator Roberts, not once has a Democratic candidate or a Republican candidate said that they lost their election by voter fraud using vote by mail. There has not been one instance of that.

And in fact, to highlight how strongly we feel that this is bipartisan, at one point,

I was one of a handful of Democrats who were for this idea. Republicans at that time
thought it would favor them because they thought that their constituency would be
more interested in this. Then the roles were reversed and now Oregonians have put it
on the ballot because overwhelmingly this is a bipartisan approach.

One of the reasons that it has not been something susceptible to fraud is the extensive checks that we have put in this, and our very fine Secretary of State will touch on this in a few moments. First, we require that people sign the ballot. Then we

verify the signatures. And because you have close to a three-week process, you have plenty of time to see if a signature is verified. And we have very substantial penalties--it is a felony if you sign somebody else's name to the ballot.

And Mr. Chairman, with your leave, I would like to put into the record an instance in Curry County where an elected official whose wife had back surgery and asked her husband to sign the ballot, he did it, they picked it up on verification and he went to jail for his conduct. So we have very substantial--

Chairman Schumer. You are a tough folk in Oregon.

Senator Wyden. We are tough folks, but we are very serious.

Chairman Schumer. Without objection, that will go in the record.

[The information of Senator Wyden submitted for the record:]

Senator Wyden. We are very serious, and I just want my colleagues to know that we don't take a back seat to anybody on this question of ballot integrity. So we have 15 million ballots that have been cast by mail since we have used it and absolutely no evidence of systematic voter fraud, and our excellent Secretary of State will get into this in just a moment.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the package of bills that I have introduced includes a universal right to vote. We consider that fundamentally about access and fairness.

No longer would there be arbitrary requirements that block voters from choosing to vote by mail. I want it understood that this wouldn't force anyone to vote by mail, nor does it require States to implement new voting systems. It, again, increases voter

choice and voter options.

Also, S. 3299 would eliminate arbitrary barriers that may prevent voters from exercising their rights in States that still have excuse requirements, and I note that the State I was born in, the State that Senator Roberts represents, was the first State to eliminate absentee ballot restrictions.

Then I have also introduced S. 3300, the Vote by Mail Act of 2010, that would create a model grant program to help States or smaller jurisdictions transition to vote by mail systems. And one of the reasons why I think, colleagues, we also ought to look at these small grant programs is it seems that every four years, when we have jurisdictions around the country having substantial problems in protecting the franchise and empowering the voters, we end up spending more Federal money on broken systems.

So it would make more sense, it seems to me, to pick up on a model that has strong bipartisan support, that has worked, that is cost effective, that is efficient, that has not in any way promoted fraud, and quite the opposite, has sanctioned any instances of tampering with a ballot aggressively. I think it would be in the country's interest to follow the Oregon model.

I will plead guilty, colleagues, to being proud of my State. I think good government is in the Oregon chromosomes. It is hwy we participate so extensively in government. It is why people show up at my town hall meets in every county, every year. This is another way to open up the doors of democracy and to do it in a bipartisan way.

237	So I thank colleagues for the chance to come, to you, Chairman Schumer, for
238	particularly showing that you can be passionate about issues like this and do it in a
239	bipartisan way.
240	[The prepared statement of Senator Wyden inserted into the record]
241	Chairman Schumer. Thank you, Senator Wyden, and we thank you for your
242	leadership on this issue.
243	Congresswoman Davis?
244	
245	STATEMENT OF HON. SUSAN DAVIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE
246	OF CALIFORNIA
247	Ms. Davis. Thank you very much. Chairman Schumer and Senator Roberts, it
248	is an honor to be here and to be here with Senator Wyden, a true leader on mail ballot
249	issues, to testify about the rising use of absentee voting and improving the process.
250	will be as brief as I can to allow for your panel of experts, because truly, these are
251	election officials whose experience offers us the greatest value.
252	My interest in bettering our elections goes back to my service as President of the
253	League of Women Voters of San Diego. Historically, the Federal Government has
254	opened the doors to those who have been shut out of the voting process, whether
255	intentionally or unintentionally, and each time those doors open wider, our country has

But our work is not done. The next step is to give hard-working Americans with

256

257

been the better for it.

busy lives the best chance to vote no matter what comes up on Election Day. I vote at polls whenever I can because I really want to. Many Americans feel the same, and I am not proposing that we take away that option. But we shouldn't consider a person any less patriotic for wanting to do his or her civic duty at the kitchen table.

The reality today is that ever-increasing numbers of voters choose to vote by mail because people pursuing the American dream are getting up earlier, commuting longer distances in more traffic, and they savor precious family time. They want to participate in democracy, but are uncertain whether they will make it to the polls between their work and family obligations.

These ballots today are longer and they are often filled with complex initiatives and some voters don't like to feel rushed at the polls. An absentee voter can choose whether to turn a ballot in right away or wait to hear everything the campaigns have to say.

Some say early in-person voting is an alternative to voting by mail. While I fully support this opportunity, I would disagree with that. Like Election Day, early voting still involves lines and limited hours and administrative burdens. Mail simply has a broader reach.

In California, we have no excuse absentee voting, meaning that anyone can vote by mail for any reason. I took the right to vote by absentee for granted until 2004, when a nurse from an excuse State told me she could not vote for President because her shift overlapping with polling hours and work wasn't an acceptable excuse for an

absentee ballot. Since she would not abandon her patients, well, she did not vote.

Her story compelled me to take action.

The fact that some 21 States still require excuses to vote by mail is a problem on three levels. First, voters in excuse States simply do not have as great an opportunity to vote as their counterparts in no excuse States. This creates an unequal playing field when we are all voting for the same President and the same Congress.

Second, the excuse requirements are arbitrary impediments and they do not increase security. For example, in Michigan, you can vote absentee if you are over 60. In Mississippi, you have to be over 65. And in Georgia, you have to be over 75. In Delaware, you need to collect and pay for a notary signature to prove that you are on vacation or that you are a student. In Tennessee, sick voters need a note directly from their doctor to the county clerk. Even work doesn't count as a valid excuse in many States, and in some, only certain kinds of work do.

And no State has a special exemption for parents of young children. I am all for setting an example by taking kids to the polls when they can, but any parent knows it is not always practical to stand in line with a couple of toddlers and then try to concentrate on a long ballot.

And the third reason absentee excuses are a problem is they can violate our privacy for no good reason. Some people say a voter's privacy is at risk voting from home. There is not much evidence of that, however, and most people talk politics with their family anyhow. What is clear is the threat to privacy States pose when they

request unnecessary information just to vote.

For example, in Virginia, you must state where you will be vacationing to get an absentee ballot. If you have a religious obligation, you have to explain that. If you are sick, you must list the nature of your disability or illness. If you are caring for someone else, you have to list that person's illness. And my favorite one, if you are pregnant, you must disclose that to the State. All of this information becomes public record and it is never verified to prevent fraud. But if you forget to fill out any part of it, sorry, you can't vote.

The good news is, we can fix all of these problems by passing the Universal Right to Vote by Mail Act. This bill merely expands a process every State already has and it clearly falls under Congress's constitutional authority to regulate the place, time, and manner of Federal elections.

In addition, the Congressional Budget Office scores it at zero and finds it is not an unfunded mandate because it is a civil rights bill.

So before I close, I just want to urge the committee to consider one more bill, as well, H.R. 2510, the Track Act, a bill we recently passed in the House and is awaiting action here in the Senate. This bill, which I co-authored with Kevin McCarthy, also on the Administration Committee, is modeled on a successful law in California and would expand on the tracking language in the MOVE bill. You are familiar with that. It would provide State grants to set up absentee ballot tracking systems so voters can know whether their absentee ballot has been sent, received by the Elections Office, and

has been counted, all three of those steps, which are very important.
I strongly believe this Congress must expand and improve absentee voting for all
eligible voters and extend a bedrock promise of our democracy, a vote for every citizen.
I want to thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing. I want
to thank you for your help and support. And I certainly want to thank your staff, as
well, that were tremendously helpful to us.
I seek permission to submit for the hearing record a letter from the Michigan
Association of County Clerks.
Chairman Schumer. Without objection.
[The information of Ms. Davis submitted for the record:]
Ms. Davis. Thank you very much.
[The prepared statement of Ms. Davis submitted for the record:]
Chairman Schumer. One quick question for Senator Wyden. When did
Oregon implement its universal by mail voting, and how was the education and
transition process? I am sure people would want to know that.
Senator Roberts. Wasn't that with Lewis and Clark when they
[Laughter.]
Senator Roberts. Lewis was for it and Clark was against it, as I recall.
Senator Wyden. And then when they saw how well it worked, they both came
on board.

341 Senator Roberts. I see.

342	Senator Wyden.	Mr. Chairman, I would also like to submit for the record, we
343	have put togetherour S	tate officials put together a history of vote by mail.

[The information of Senator Wyden submitted for the record]

Chairman Schumer. Oh, good.

Senator Wyden. But essentially, there is a 30-year chronology dating back from 1981, where we started testing vote by mail for local elections, the chronology. We made vote by mail permanent in 1987. The majority of counties began to use it for local elections, as I noted. We held the Statewide special election in 1995 and 1996. In January of 1996, when I was chosen Oregon's first new United States Senator in almost 30 years, we had 66 percent turnout, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Schumer. Wow.

Senator Wyden. This was in the dead of winter. It was unbelievably cold.

And colleagues, I don't remember it--

Chairman Schumer. That was because of the quality of the candidate.

Senator Wyden. Well, as all of us know, Senator Smith was an extraordinary elected official, as well, and he and I worked very closely together. But I note that at that time, when 66 percent turned out, people compared it to the previous Senate special election. We had one, which I believe was in Texas, that had turnout somewhere in the 20 percent range. So you get a sense of what the extraordinary effect this has had in terms of increasing voter turnout. Make this chronology a part of the record--

363 Chairman Schumer. Without objection.

Senator Wyden. --but we have a 30-year successful history, and that is why I feel comfortable about coming before you and arguing that it ought to be expanded, is we have had a chance to work through the kinks.

Particularly just one last point, Mr. Chairman. You have been very gracious on time. When you look at this fraud issue, if a ballot is fraudulent, under the Oregon system, it never gets counted because we have used that three-week period to essentially check the envelopes, identify the problems, fix the errors, investigate any questionable ballots, as opposed to what happens when you have the traditional process of the polling place. The vote has already been counted and then you are playing catch-up ball to deal with retrieval issues as opposed to what we think has been successful in terms of getting at these questionable activities up front.

Chairman Schumer. And to Congresswoman Davis, California's rate of vote by mail is extraordinarily high, 44 percent. Why do you think that is, compared to, say, other States that have the same law, basically the same law in effect?

Ms. Davis. Well, one thing, they have made it permanent voting so that people don't have to actually request an absentee ballot every time there is an election. They can--that is basically a permanent absentee voter and I think that makes a large difference, and people have found that it works for them.

Chairman Schumer. Senator Roberts? Thank you both.

Senator Roberts. With a highly mobile society, more especially with California,

384 how does that work? It is a permanent situation by address, I am assuming. 385 Ms. Davis. Yes. If people move, then of course they have to re-register at that 386 address. 387 Senator Roberts. Sure. But I would guess, what, 20 percent at least in 388 California--389 Ms. Davis. Are moving around? 390 Chairman Schumer. Are moving to Kansas. 391 [Laughter.] 392 Senator Roberts. I don't think so. 393 Ms. Davis. A lot of them do move within the State, but even if they move down 394 the street--Senator Roberts. We have very strict immigration laws. 395 396 [Laughter.] 397 Ms. Davis. But the other thing that has been mentioned is the signature is really the key in California, as well. I have been at the registrar when they are checking 398 399 all of that and they do. They go through every signature--400 Senator Roberts. I don't think there is a better salesperson for this than you 401 have represented yourself before the committee. If you have been talking to your 402 colleagues in regards to the 22 States that do not have this, it would seem to me you have a very convincing argument. 403

I think I can say the same thing about Kansas. I am not too eager to

404

superimpose by federal fiat upon the 22 who do not. You may think they live in the Dark Ages or whatever it is that one may think, but being the sales person that you are, of course, you have other duties to perform. Have you talked to some of your colleagues in some of the States that you were talking about in regards to the need for voting by mail?

Ms. Davis. I certainly have, and you are absolutely right that people believe that this is in the venue of the State. I think what we have to point out to them is that, actually, traditionally, while the States have run elections, no court has really said that the Tenth Amendment trumps Article I, Section 4, which basically says that the Congress can determine the place and time. We have HAVA. We have Motor Voter. We have done a number of things to try and provide some standardization.

So I have given them those arguments and I think that they do tend to fall back on the State argument. But when they have an opportunity to talk to their registrars and their county people, I think that they come around often with the feeling that this doesn't make sense anymore. It may have at one time.

Senator Roberts. I am a veteran of the Motor Voter meaningful dialogue that we had in the House Administration Committee and had three amendments. One, you had to be a citizen; two, that it was an unfunded mandate and we should pay for it; and then, third--oh, what the heck was the third one? But at any rate, another common sense amendment. They all went down by a party line vote.

I am trying to think of the Washington Representative that was such a leader in that--Congressman Swift, Al Swift. And then ten years later, I went back over all of the evidence that he indicated State by State in terms of what he thought would represent an increased voter turnout. As it turned out, it didn't affect it much one way or the other. What affected it was the candidates and the timing and everything that involves a political year. So I still have some reservations about that. But at any rate--

Ms. Davis. I think one of the things you might look at is for all of those States that have made this decision and moved forward, none of them have changed and gone back.

Senator Roberts. I understand that. It would be very difficult to do that under the circumstances. I think, politically--the third one was, by the way, if the State had a

more strict law enforcement requirement than the bill actually provided, that that would prevail. And it seemed to me those three things were very reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to get into a renewed debate on Motor Voter, but anyway, that struck a chord. Thank you very much.

Ms. Davis. Thank you.

Chairman Schumer. I thank both of our witnesses for being here.

Senator Wyden. Thank you.

are Kate Brown, the Secretary

of State of Oregon, recommended by Senator Wyden, John Fortier from the AEI, and

Rokey Suleman, who is from the Board of Elections in the District of Columbia. I will

read a brief biography of each and then we will ask each witness to submit their entire

statement to the record and speak for five minutes.

Chairman Schumer. And now we will call the next panel to come forward, who

Ms. Kate Brown currently serves as the Secretary of State of Oregon, a position she has held since 2008. She was elected to Oregon's House of Representatives in 1991, served there until 1997 when she was elected to the Oregon Senate in 2004. She became the first woman elected Majority Leader in the Oregon Senate, served there for five years, earned her law degree from Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon. Welcome. And one of your Statewide colleagues, John Kroger, worked for me for a number of years.

John C. Fortier is a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute as the

principal contributor to the election reform project done in conjunction with the Brookings Institute, a member of the Committee to Modernize Voter Registration, and the author of Absentee and Early Voting: Trends, Promises, and Perils. He taught political science at the University of Pennsylvania, University of Delaware, Boston College, and Harvard. He earned his undergraduate degree from Georgetown, Ph.D. from Boston College.

And Mr. Rokey Suleman currently serves as the Executive Director for the Board of Elections and Ethics in the District of Columbia, where he is responsible for the maintenance of voter records and election preparation. Before joining the D.C. Board, he served in Fairfax County, Virginia, as the General Registrar in the Office of Elections, as well as in Warren, Ohio, as the Deputy Director of the Trumball County Board of Elections.

You are all welcome. Secretary Brown, your entire statement is read in the record and you may begin.

STATEMENT OF KATE BROWN, OREGON SECRETARY OF STATE, SALEM, OREGON

Ms. Brown. Thank you, Mr. Chair and committee members. For the record, I

am Kate Brown, Oregon's Secretary of State, and thank you for inviting me here to

testify today. I really appreciate both Senator Wyden and Congresswoman Davis's

leadership in attempting to provide Americans with universal access to vote by mail.

You have my written testimony in front of you. I would like to highlight a few

of those points.

Oregon's 30-year experience with vote by mail has been a resounding success.

Vote by mail enhances turnout, is cost effective, and secures the integrity of the ballot.

We know that Oregonians like vote by mail because we can measure the effects it has had on turnout over the past few election cycles. Oregon has been in the top ten of States in voter turnout amongst registered voters for the last two Presidential elections. It is the only State in the top ten that does not have same-day voter registration, another subject for another day.

It is easy to understand why. With vote by mail, we make it easier, more accessible, and more convenient for Oregonians to cast an informed ballot. It is easier for folks living in rural Oregon, miles away from the Elections Office, to drop their ballot in a mailbox. It is accessible for people with disabilities to vote independently in the privacy of their own homes. And it is convenient for busy families, as Congresswoman Davis mentioned.

Vote by mail is cost effective. The last general election at a polling place was in 1998. It cost \$1.81 per voter. Our special election in January of 2010 cost \$1.05 per voter, not including inflation.

We continue to add efficiencies, as well. Last legislative session, we passed a bill which allows counties to process the ballots before Election Day. As you all know, voters and elected officials want results immediately in this day and age, and in our last Statewide election, we released more than three-quarters of the results within

half-an-hour of the voting deadline.

In addition, as Senator Wyden mentioned, vote by mail is secure. To combat any attempts at fraud, we have put a number of security measures in place to make vote by mail as secure as traditional polling place systems. For example, to ensure the integrity of each ballot, we check every single signature, and I know this because it happened to me. One election, I got a call saying my signature didn't match my signature on the voter registration card and would I come down to the Elections Office to verify my ballot. Of course, I did.

We are also using tracking measures by including a bar code on every single envelope so we can track a given ballot while it is in the custody of Elections. And by November of 2010, voters will be able to track their ballots and confirm that they have been received by elections officials, just like we can track our purchases on eBay.

As Senator Wyden mentioned, the penalties for voter fraud are severe. I have another case in Josephine County where a man forged the name of his younger brother to register to vote. His younger brother was a citizen. We caught him. He was discovered when his brother was summoned for jury duty and the county learned that his brother was only 14 years old. He was convicted of four felonies and deported, and now he can never become a citizen of the United States.

Finally, given the length of time of the election, as Senator Wyden mentioned, with the ballots going out about 18 days ahead of time, county clerks and elections officials have ample opportunity to resolve unanticipated problems.

It has truly been a collaborative process and we work closely with our partners at the United States Postal Service.

Senator Schumer, I would let you know that Secretary Reed has a letter detailing the experience in the State of Washington and he can tell you why Pierce County is not all vote by mail. But I believe it is the only county in Washington that doesn't have vote by mail.

In sum, we are really proud of our system in Oregon and we are very encouraged by the willingness of Congress and this committee to discuss its merits. However, as excited as I am about the prospect of vote by mail going national, I know that I have to temper my excitement in light of the long path we took to fully implement the system, and that was a full 30 years.

Senator Wyden's approach is creative and a common sense way to give all voters across the country access to the convenience of voting by mail in a very "take it easy" approach.

I would like to thank the members of the committee for having me here today.

I heartily encourage you to support the three bills that the good Senator Wyden has introduced. And if Oregon's experience is any indication, universal access to vote by mail has the potential to affect our country's elections for the better. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Brown follows:]

Chairman Schumer. Thank you, Secretary Brown.

541 Mr. Fortier?

STATEMENT OF JOHN FORTIER, THE AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE,

544 WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Fortier. Thank you, Chairman Schumer and Senator Roberts. I commend you on having this hearing today because we have had a silent revolution in voting that has taken place over the last 30 years. Thirty years ago, we could look at the States and there would be some similarities. Most States would have about five percent people voting by absentee. You would have those people with reasons. They would be overseas, they would be ill, or they would be out of town on business or some personal business.

And starting in the late 1970s and early 1980s, a number of States started to change this, and we have seen a tremendous rise in voting by mail, but I also want to highlight a tremendous rise in voting early in person. Both of these phenomena have added together, add up to about a third of voters voting before Election Day, a tremendous change which has really been State by State.

Some States, Oregon, 100 percent, Washington State, nearly there, are voting by mail. Some States--New York is now moving in this direction but has traditionally had very low rates of absentee voting. Many of the Northeast States still have those rates of five percent or less.

Some States have moved very heavily to voting early in person but do not do much voting absentee. Texas and Tennessee were the leaders. Georgia and North

Carolina also fall into this category. And then there are a number of States who do a lot of both.

So I note to you the great variety that is out there in the States, and I think that is some caution to what Congress should weigh in on, whether Congress should put early voting in person, or early voting by mail above other forms of voting.

Now, if I were advising you as a State, I do have some reservations about moving towards voting by mail. Of course, it is needed for a certain percentage of voters who cannot make it to the polls, but that does not mean that you could not go to a certain form of convenience voting, and that is voting early in person. And the reason I would recommend that method of voting rather than voting by mail or expanding voting by mail in a significant way is several reasons.

One, it is not a secret ballot, a vote by mail. It is needed by some people, but once that ballot has left the polling place, it is in the hands of someone. It is potentially out there for others to see. And while most of us do not have pressures on us as to how to vote, there are some that do. There are vulnerable voters. There are people with prying spouses or bullying employers or who face a certain sort of peer pressure being part of a group, and the fact that the ballot is out there makes it very hard for those people to resist those pressures. If you go to a polling place, you may have all the pressures in the world, but ultimately, you pull the curtain behind you and you vote as you like no matter what your friends, spouse, or peers have told you to do.

There are also problems with the chain of custody. Certainly, an absentee

ballot or a mail ballot leaves the polling place. It is sent. It is requested. It has to be turned back. And the problems that we have found have been in the fraud area.

While I don't think we can prove in any way that they are extensive, they certainly are to do with people intercepting ballots, people requesting ballots for people who are not eligible voters or are not where they are supposed to be. There is an extra opportunity for fraud that does not exist at the polling place.

I also think there are some problems with the way ballots are handled, and I want to accept Oregon for this. In many ways, I am a critic of voting by mail, but I think Oregon, when it does voting by mail, does it very well. That is not the case all around the country. There are many States who do not take the same care of checking signatures, of ensuring that there is contact with voters if there are problems.

And I point to the Minnesota example, where Minnesota, a contentious recent election, we had problems that both sides argued about, about ballots being not counted that should have been counted or ballots that were counted that didn't meet the requirements, and ultimately also some problems potentially of votes being cast with errors in them which are not able to be corrected on the ballot itself, whereas at a polling place, there are error checking mechanisms in a number of voting systems.

You know, my caution on moving towards requiring voting by mail everywhere is that, look, we have a very good other system, voting in person early, and we wouldn't--I am going to speak for Secretary Brown here. I am not sure she would be excited if we passed a bill and said that we should require there be early voting in person everywhere

all the time or in an extensive way. I don't think we should impose one or the other.

I think the States are making decisions. And I will note, I think that the statistics show that we are moving more in the direction of voting early in person. The recent rise in that has been greater than the other.

My last point is that just because I don't think we should ask States to--we shouldn't force States to offer absentee ballots to everyone, we should consider making some of the improvements that are dealing with the tracking, with the signatures and other things that Oregon and other States do well.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Fortier inserted into the record]

Chairman Schumer. Thank you, Mr. Fortier. You hit the nail on the head exactly at five minutes.

So we now go to Mr. Suleman.

STATEMENT OF ROKEY W. SULEMAN II, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, D.C. BOARD OF ELECTIONS AND ETHICS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Suleman. Thank you, Chairman Schumer and Senator Roberts. Universal access to an absentee ballot is something that should be available to every U.S. citizen.

I have been an election official in a State with universal access to an absentee ballot--that would be Ohio, an official in a State that severely restricts absentee ballot access--that would be Virginia, and am currently the Chief Election Official in the District of Columbia, a jurisdiction that is now making the transition from excuse-based

absentee to no excuse absentee voting. I can speak with firsthand experience to the administrative difficulty that results from restricting ballot access through the mail.

Demands on the lives of voters have grown as our country has grown. We owe it to our citizens to give them as much access to the ballot as they request. No fault absentee voting does just that in a place that is convenient, their home.

Some argue that a vote by mail system erodes a community's sense of civic duty, that a ballot received through the mail is equal to junk mail received on a daily basis. I disagree. I believe that voting by mail gives families as much of an opportunity, if not more so, to educate their children about voting. Not every parent has the luxury to have their children tag along to the polls with them on Election Day. With vote by mail, families can sit around the kitchen table and discuss the issues and the candidates.

Virginia places significant restrictions on access to an absentee ballot through the mail. A person must meet one of numerous requirements in order to vote absentee either in person or via the mail. A voter must check a box on a form and also give supporting information for their reason. For example, a voter must check "personal business" or "vacation" and then list the place that they are visiting. Failure to list the location results in a mandatory denial of that application.

Medical reasons for requesting an absentee ballot through the mail also require supporting information. If a person does not list the nature of their illness on the application, the application must be denied. The medical reason to vote absentee may be very personal and subject the voter to public embarrassment. Absentee

applications are records available to inspection by the public. Although there is some thought that the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, HIPAA, may apply, election officials have received no guidance to how to balance the right to privacy against the freedom of information regarding these documents. We face the prospect of serious litigation in the future if these requirements are still in place.

Requiring an excuse to vote absentee also places a significant administrative burden on local election officials. The denial rate in my office in Fairfax, Virginia, for absentee applications was very high in 2008. A significant number of voters check a reason but do not supply the supporting information. My staff has to review each application for completeness. Failure to properly complete the form requires a notice to the voter informing them of the deficiency and supplying a new application. This is all done by hand.

During the November 2008 general election season, my former office denied thousands of applications because of these simple failures to supply burdensome information. There were several file drawers filled with applications that were denied. Some voters were denied multiple times before submitting a properly completed application. This took thousands of dollars out of our budget for the increase in man hours, postage, and supplies needed to process these applications. This is a tremendous waste of valuable tax dollars. No excuse access to a ballot through the mail would have saved that office thousands of dollars in processing and overtime costs.

Some opponents of no excuse absentee voting by mail claim a person should be

able to fill out a form properly and failure to do so should disqualify their vote. I have had to deny applications to former U.S. Congressmen and current U.S. Supreme Court Justices because of failure to supply supporting information. If these educated folks make mistakes, imagine the mistakes made by a 90-year-old voter that has difficulty reading and writing.

The transition from excuse-based absentee voting to no excuse absentee voting in Ohio caused no problems or increased fraud. As a matter of fact, in today's Cleveland Plain Dealer, they indicate that the majority of votes in Cuyahoga County in yesterday's primary came in through the mail.

It is my professional opinion that increased access to ballots through the mail does not lead to an increase in voter fraud. The numbers I have seen just do not support the assertion. What universal access through the mail does is give a voter another option in casting a ballot, an option that more and more voters across the country desire.

There are other benefits to vote by mail. Election officials will also be able to take advantage of technology to let a voter know where their ballot is. By placing bar codes on both the original and return envelope, my office in the District will have the ability to tell every absentee voter the status of their ballot on our website up to the point the ballot is on the vehicle of their postal carrier. While we are implementing this technology to comply with the MOVE Act, this process will be easily extended to all vote by mail voters at nearly no cost. This process is expected to significantly reduce

the number of "where is my ballot" calls to the office, which in turn will reduce staffing costs. The combination of convenience and technology will be a tremendous benefit for the voters in the District.

It is my belief the District will start to see such a shift to early and no fault absentee voting that we will be able to combine precincts. This will provide my office with thousands of dollars in savings from poll worker reduction, reduced training costs, fewer polling location rental fees, and less overtime.

No fault absentee voting is a concept whose time has arrived. Voters like the ease of use. Election officials as well as the funding authorities appreciate savings realized in the elimination of polling locations. This is a good government bill. This bill will save taxpayer money and provide greater access to our government. It is a bill whose time has arrived. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Suleman follows:]

Chairman Schumer. Thank you. And again, I want to thank our witnesses for observing the time limit.

The first question I have is for Secretary Brown and Mr. Suleman in particular, education, and particularly the experience with Oregon. When Senator Wyden rehearsed the history, it was sort of gradual. It started in local elections. I guess it wasn't mandatory. You could go to the polls, et cetera. How long did it take for Oregon voters to become familiar with the process? How do you educate new voters? You have an influx of many citizens from other States who come to Oregon. Tell us a

710 little bit about that.

Ms. Brown. Mr. Chair, thank you for the question. As Senator Wyden suggested, the process to moving to vote by mail in Oregon was gradual. A Republican Secretary of State passed legislation in 1981 to allow for local elections, and it wasn't until the voter initiative passed in 1998 that we went to full vote by mail. That being said, basically, no one under the age of 30 has ever voted in a polling place in Oregon, so it certainly has been a gradual transition.

I think the beauty of Senator Wyden's bill is it doesn't force the States to do vote by mail. It allows the voters to have the choice of voting by mail, and it is really an expansion. My understanding is that all the States have access to some type of absentee voting. So it really just expands the systems that the States already have in place.

In terms of education, I am in the schools on a regular basis working to educate young Oregonians that we vote by mail and how we vote by mail. And we, frankly, have used our Federal Help America Vote Act dollars to educate voters about the voting process in Oregon.

Chairman Schumer. Mr. Suleman, you mentioned Ohio. That was very interesting, that in the primary, a majority of votes were cast by mail in Cuyahoga County. How is the process going there with educating voters, voters adapting, et cetera?

Mr. Suleman. The election offices in Cuyahoga County and Franklin County,

Ohio, the two largest jurisdictions in Ohio, are very proactive and they send out
applications to all of the voters to fill out and submit ballots and it has worked very well
for them.

My experience in my county in Ohio was we did a limited approach because we didn't have the local resources to send out applications to all of our voters. However, we knew that there was going to be difficulty with the applications, so we sent out--inside the application itself, we sent a form that described actually how to fill out the application so when the ballot came back there weren't any mistakes on the ballot so we could pass that forward.

Each county has taken it upon themselves to educate the voters a little differently, but it has proven to be a great success.

Chairman Schumer. And it is working?

Mr. Suleman. It is working.

Chairman Schumer. Okay. Secretary Brown, Mr. Fortier mentioned some of the complaints with this process. We have talked about the fraud, so I am going to leave Senator Wyden's comments on that in Oregon. But what about this idea that you lose some of your privacy from, I think his words were, prying spouses and employers who were trying to pressure people, or something like that. Do you get many complaints about that from Oregon voters?

Ms. Brown. Mr. Chair, actually, we have had no complaints regarding coercion amongst spouses or partners in terms of coercion around the ballot, and we have

752	actually done some research. The prior administration reviewed divorce petitions
753	looking for allegations regarding coercion between spouses
754	Chairman Schumer. No divorces because of election differences?
755	Ms. Brown. Correct. Correct. But the other thing I would add, Mr. Chair, is
756	that
757	Chairman Schumer. It would be a pretty fragile marriage.
758	[Laughter.]
759	Ms. Brown. I have been very involved in the domestic violence community in
760	my work in the legislature and I have never heard any complaints about this particular
761	issue. So we
762	Chairman Schumer. What about with employers?
763	Ms. Brown. Uh
764	Chairman Schumer. No, but employers would say, hey, I want you to vote
765	Republican or Democrat and let us see your ballot.
766	Ms. Brown. Mr. Chair, we have not heard any complaints about that. The
767	legislature recently passed legislation in Oregon regarding, shall we say, meetings with
768	employers that doesn't require employees to attend meetings. But no, I haven't had
769	any complaints regarding employers forcing them to turn in the ballot.
770	Chairman Schumer. Mr. Fortier, when you brought these up, is that
771	speculative, hypothetical, or do you know of instances and can you mention a few to us?

Mr. Fortier. Well, if I could just turn back in a way to the history, we actually

had two reform movements, one right before the other, a reform movement at the end of the 19th century which put in the privacy of the ballot, the Australian ballot, and shortly thereafter, we had a reform that States started introducing absentee ballots.

And some of the reasons for these requirements to go to a notary or provide a reason to vote absentee were because State Constitutions had enshrined the idea of privacy of the ballot and they wanted to balance these things.

I am not advocating going back to a notary public, which I will note actually I did have to go to the first time I voted absentee, but you can see the reason for wanting to do so, that you go to a notary public, you show a blank ballot, you then are standing over there--

Chairman Schumer. But any specific instances here?

Mr. Fortier. Well, I mean, the reasons at the time, I will just say, of course, were worse than we would expect today with political machines which had walked into the ballot box with a color-coded ballot. You knew how you voted.

I just think you are unlikely to find the subtly pressured voter or the voter who is under some pressure to come forward and say, look, I have these problems. They are vulnerable voters who potentially have someone giving them a hard time and might actually be able to see the ballot. I mean, certainly you can pay someone to see their ballot and turn it in, as well. It is not prohibited, or there is no way to ultimately get around that.

I applaud Oregon for doing lots of things to stop that, and I don't think we should

get rid of absentee ballots. We need them for some people. But in many ways, the polling places provide these protections that that sort of voting doesn't. And when a State like Texas or Tennessee wants to do a lot of convenience voting, a lot of voting early at polling places and say voting by mail is for only people who really need it, I think that is a good choice for those States to make.

Chairman Schumer. Okay. And one final question for all three witnesses.

Could some States' motivation here be that they don't want some people to vote or certain people to vote or make it more difficult? Is it that States that had traditionally denied voting rights to certain groups have tougher laws still to this day for any particular reason? Any of the panel on that. Or is that just gone, thankfully?

Mr. Suleman. No. Quite honestly, in my professional opinion, that is the reason why the extreme absentee restriction to vote by mail exists in Virginia. I believe that they just do not want to open up access to the ballot to folks.

Chairman Schumer. Mr. Fortier, you disagree with that?

Mr. Fortier. Yes, I do. I mean, I think most of the States that still have these restrictions are actually in the Northeast, so some of those historical reasons may not be quite there. And, look, many of these reasons, we may want to revisit them at a State level and say, well, maybe this particular provision for providing a reason isn't what we want, or maybe we may need to make it easier. But I am not sure that the main reason is to keep turnout down.

We didn't really talk about turnout, and I think there are some real problems

with the claim that voting by mail increases turnout. Most academic research has actually shown that it does not. There are some contradictory studies, but there are certainly a number of studies that show a negative result. So I think the consensus is that it doesn't increase turnout by itself, nor does voting early in person. It is convenient. There are some benefits to it. But it is not something that is an automatic turnout increaser.

Chairman Schumer. Thank you all.

Senator Roberts?

Senator Roberts. Well, thank you all. I truly appreciate your taking the time.

I know you are very busy and it has been very interesting.

We had a hearing on voter registration issues last March and one of the witnesses at that hearing submitted a study showing turnout increased nationwide over a period, I think that was highlighted by Ms. Brown when she said increased six percent in your State in the last three Presidential elections, and then I think there were similar numbers, too, in other States that had a similar system.

But according to the Center for the Study of the American Electorate--I don't know who that is, by the way, but it sounds pretty good--average turnout nationwide for 2000, 2004, and 2008 Presidential elections was 59.26, almost 60 percent, while average turnout for 1988, 1992, and 1996--it occurs to me that is when I ran--was 54.3 percent, about five percent below, actually 4.96. So the turnout increase over that period was pretty close to the national average.

Do you have any comments on that, Ms. Brown, and also to Mr. Fortier?

Ms. Brown. Mr. Chair, Senator Roberts, what I can relay to you is that Oregon's turnout amongst registered voters has been in the top ten in the nation during the past couple of Presidentials. In terms of non-registered voters, we are, frankly, in the middle of the pack, and that is why we moved to--in March, we moved to an online voter registration system. We used our Federal Help America Vote Act dollars to move to an online system to make it easier and more accessible for Oregonians to register online if they have a State ID or driver's license. So we are really working hard on the registration end.

Senator Roberts. Mr. Fortier?

Mr. Fortier. I will just say, I want to commend Oregon because Oregon does have high voter turnout, but it has had high voter turnout for quite a long time, before it had all vote by mail elections. So I think that in itself has not been the reason for its high turnout.

There are a number of studies, I would point to some in California, where there are some districts where people are required to vote by mail because the number of people who have the same ballot is quite small, and a number of academics have studied those districts and found actually a negative result. I don't claim that that is the case, but the range of results is from some small negatives to some small positives.

The one exception, I will say, is for local elections, small really low turnout local elections, local referenda. There, we do see some significant turnout. But for any

major Statewide race or even local State legislative or for House of Representatives, those races, we don't see an increase in turnout.

Senator Roberts. I am going to refer to the Dark Ages when I attended the Kansas State University, the home of the ever-optimistic and fighting Wildcats, and we had two political science professors that were pretty famous, or infamous. One was trying to lower the voting age to 16. This is before even 18 and if you are old enough to fight, you are old enough to vote, which I always thought was a rather odd connection, but I can understand it.

And another political science professor who, I would say to the Chairman, had a very unique version. He said a higher voter turnout isn't necessarily good, that the old expression, it doesn't matter who you vote for, just make sure you vote, if you really look at that, that is a pretty stupid observation. I mean, that is you would just vote for anybody, just vote. Now, that happens in this country, I understand that, for various reasons. And so he thought that the best election would probably be about a 20 percent turnout and everybody else is playing golf and things were getting along just fine. I happen to also harken back, that was the Eisenhower years and—

Chairman Schumer. You would have very few municipal golf courses.

Senator Roberts. That is true. We would have very few golf courses.

Actually, we have a lot of pastures out in Kansas that would work out.

[Laughter.]

877 Senator Roberts. But Ike was President. It was eight years of peace and

prosperity. People seemed to be less interested in dramatic legislation, et cetera, et cetera.

But at any rate, I am not asking you to comment on that except that an informed vote, I think, is probably the most important thing. But Ms. Brown, you have raised something that really makes my eyebrows go up. You argue that in your State, the civic ritual of voting at the polling place has been replaced with a new civic tradition of families getting together to discuss and vote their ballots together.

I am thinking of my own family and then I am also thinking of maybe a family reunion in which this could take place. I shudder at that thought, knowing various members of my family--extended.

[Laughter.]

Senator Roberts. I have one son and three daughters--pardon me, two daughters. I am into grandchildren now, but that is another thing. I ran for the Senate in 1996. My one daughter was in school at the University of Kansas. I don't know how that happened, but anyway, she enrolled in that school and completed her degree. At any rate, the other daughter and the other son did precisely what their Great-Grandfather and their Grandfather and their father had recommended in regards to voting, along with the various mothers.

The other daughter, however, decided that she marched to a different drum. I can remember the case of where her brother put one of my bumper stickers on her car, which I thought would be an understandable thing. She immediately took it off. She

didn't put my opponent's bumper sticker up there. To date, I do not know if she voted for me in 1996, and I have never asked her how she voted in this last election.

But I can see--I am not too sure that this is a civic ritual in regards to our family.

It is not that we do not have meaningful dialogue about the issues of the day and various candidates and their qualifications, but at any rate, I don't know. Isn't the key difference that while both systems allow families to sit around and discuss the candidates, only one assures a secret ballot as opposed to everybody signing at the appropriate time and everybody pretty much knowing how everybody voted, which I am not sure is a good thing?

Ms. Brown. Mr. Chair, Senator Roberts, I have a number of responses and I will try and be responsive to your question, but--

Senator Roberts. Well, help me with my daughter first.

911 [Laughter.]

Ms. Brown. Okay. Well, I will say, when I first ran for the legislature, I ended up running against a three-term incumbent and was outspent two-to-one. I won that race by seven votes.

Senator Roberts. Wow.

Ms. Brown. And one of the reasons I ran to become Secretary of State is because I believe that every vote really does matter and needs to be counted.

In terms of the power differential, and Chair Schumer raised this earlier, I think that is the beauty of the Wyden-Davis approach, and that is it allows the individual voter

to determine whether he or she wants to do the vote by mail. If someone wants to retain the polling place system and go to the polls, they can do that. That is the beauty of the Wyden approach. It gives the voter the choice.

In terms of the family conversations, the wonderful thing that happens in Oregon is that our voters' pamphlets come out about three weeks ahead of time, so the photos are there, the statements are there from the candidates. The ballots come about a half-a-week later. It gives people an opportunity to discuss what is on the ballot. We have a complicated ballot in Oregon normally because we have an initiative process to further complicate everything, and so normally, there are about five to eight initiatives on the ballot, as well.

So people discuss these issues in neighborhood associations, in churches, in libraries. Certainly, there is discussion around family dining room tables. I know that folks try to influence people, but to my knowledge, there is no coercion happening. We haven't had any evidence of coercion.

And I don't know what I can do to help you with your daughter other than to share with her my story of seven votes and that we would hate it if you were to lose.

936 Senator Roberts. Well, you will probably agree with her. That is the thing 937 that--

[Laughter.]

Senator Roberts. One other thing. I am way over time here, and I apologize to the Chairman and everybody else. This is probably not really pertinent, but it does

make me stop and think a minute. I was editor and publisher of a weekly newspaper in Phoenix during the explosion of Phoenix, and it is still exploding, in more ways than one, but at any rate, it was on the West side of Phoenix and obviously the home of Barry Goldwater. And I actually traveled with the Senator and had great respect for him, and then obviously it was the Johnson-Goldwater election. In that newspaper, I editorialized that perhaps the experience of Johnson weighed heavily in favor of voting for him and wrote that editorial and voted accordingly.

My father, who is the former Republican National Chairman under Eisenhower, did not get a copy of the paper--thank God--until about two weeks later. Coercion? You have no idea about the coercion that followed for years afterwards. I have never made that mistake again in regards to at least a decision like that, either that or I just simply, might add, just sort of took it for granted that I voted the way that he thought that I should vote. But anyway, I would assume that not all families are like mine.

I want to thank you all very much and thank you for your personal examples and your expertise. I think it has been a good hearing, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Schumer. Well, thank you, Senator Roberts, and you helped make it a good hearing, as did our three witnesses.

I would say to you, I just had a little experience. I ran for the Assembly at age

23. My parents, particularly my mother, thought I should go practice law and make

some money and she told many of her friends not to vote for me so I would get this

dumb idea of being a politician from my thick head. So you are not alone.

962	[Laughter.]
963	Chairman Schumer. Anyway, thank you all for coming.
964	The hearing is adjourned.
965	[Whereupon, at 11:17 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]